## Remarks

The non-final Office Action dated May 14, 2009 lists the following new grounds of rejection: claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over applicant's admitted prior art ("APA", specification, page 1) in view of Kawaguchi (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,189). Applicant traverses all of the rejections and, unless explicitly stated by the Applicant, does not acquiesce to any objection, rejection or averment made in the Office Action.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 103(a) rejection because the cited combination of references lacks correspondence to the claimed invention. For example, neither of the asserted references teaches the claimed invention "as a whole" (§ 103(a)) including aspects regarding, *e.g.,* a logic circuit configured to provide an on-off signal to a DC/DC converter, the logic circuit being powered by the same DC input voltage that the DC/DC converter converts to a lower voltage. Because neither reference teaches these aspects, no reasonable combination of these references can provide correspondence to the claimed invention. As such, the § 103 rejection fails.

More specifically, the APA reference does not teach a logic circuit as claimed and as powered by the same DC input voltage that the DC/DC converter converts to a lower voltage, as acknowledged by the Office Action. The '189 reference also does not teach such a logic circuit. Instead, the '189 reference teaches that starting control terminal CT (*i.e.,* the asserted logic circuit) is provided with a low voltage power VR (*e.g.,* 12 V) via main switch 9 or low voltage VK via diode 18 to turn on DC/DC converter 6. *See, e.g.,* Figure 1, Col. 6:19-32 and Col. 6:57-65. The Office Action's asserted DC input voltage (*i.e.,* the voltage received by the starting control terminal CT via diode) that allegedly powers the asserted logic circuit (*i.e.,* the starting control terminal CT) is not the same DC input voltage as the high voltage HVI that the DC/DC converter 6 converts to lower voltage VRO. *See, e.g.,* Col. 5:37-44. Thus, the '189 reference does not teach a logic circuit that is powered by the same DC input voltage that the DC/DC converter converts to a lower voltage, as in the claimed invention.

Moreover, the '189 reference further fails to correspond to aspects of the claimed invention directed to the logic circuit being configured to provide the on-off signal to the DC/DC converter in response to an idle state in which circuit elements used for

operating a vehicle are switched off, the circuit elements supplied with power via the DC/DC converter. The portion of the '189 reference cited by the Office Action in connection with providing the on-off signal to the DC/DC converter in response to an idle state (*i.e.,* Col. 7:57-Col. 8:34) does not teach turning off the DC/DC converter 6, when the low voltage loads 5 of the vehicle, which are powered by the DC/DC converter 6 are switched off. Instead, the '189 reference teaches that the low voltage VR is stopped (*i.e.,* the DC/DC converter 6 is turned off) responsive to the high voltage HVI supplied to the primary side of the DC/DC converter 6 being reduced to a specified value. The drop in the high voltage HVI is caused by power being supplied to the loads 5. *See, e.g.,* Col. 8:10-30. Thus, the '189 reference turns off the DC/DC converter 6 when the loads 5 are turned on because the loads 5 are over-discharging the main battery 2, instead of providing the on-off signal to the DC/DC converter in response to an idle state in which the circuit elements used for operating the vehicle are switched off, as in the claimed invention.

In view of the above, the cited combination of references does not correspond to the claimed invention. Accordingly, the § 103(a) rejection is improper and Applicant requests that it be withdrawn.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Peter Zawilski, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9063 (or the undersigned).

*Please direct all correspondence to:*

Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: _____

Name: Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
651-686-6633
(NXPS.266PA)